



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/752,435

01/06/2004

Lee Bolduc

9494.18510

3762

26308 7590 05/14/2010
RYAN KROMHOLZ & MANION, S.C.
POST OFFICE BOX 26618
MILWAUKEE, WI 53226

EXAMINER

SEVERSON, RYAN J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3731

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/14/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

RKMIPPatent@rkmiplaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/752,435	Applicant(s) BOLDUC ET AL.	
	Examiner Ryan J. Severson	Art Unit 3731	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 23,28 and 31-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 23,28 and 31-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 23, 28, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parodi et al. (WO 00/16701) in view of Pinchuk (5,855,598),**

Layne et al. (6,398,803), and Lentz (5,522,881). Parodi et al. disclose a fastener applier (50) is used to secure a prosthesis (100) using helical fasteners (80, see figure 6). Multiple fasteners are deployed (see figure 3) to secure the prosthesis at an aneurysm in an aorta (see figure 2 and page 9, lines 18-22).

3. However, Parodi et al. fail to disclose a first and second prosthesis telescopically positioned relative to one another. Attention is drawn to Pinchuk, who teaches it is known in the art to use a telescopically fitted multiple-component prosthesis (see figures 18-21) to allow the prosthesis to support the vessel from the neck region adjacent the renal arteries to the iliac arteries. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the prosthesis of Parodi et al. a multiple-component prosthesis to provide for support of the iliac arteries as well as the aneurysm in the aorta.

4. Further regarding claim 23, the combination of Parodi et al. and Pinchuk does not disclose the graft material has a greater density at the ends than in the intermediate

Art Unit: 3731

region. Attention is drawn to Layne et al., who teach a graft may have more dense ends (because the intermediate region has openings 44) to increase the flexibility of the prosthesis in the intermediate region. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the intermediate region of the graft of the combination of Parodi et al. and Pinchuk less dense in the manner taught by Layne et al. to increase the flexibility of the prosthesis in the intermediate region.

5. Further regarding claim 23, the combination of Parodi et al., Pinchuk, and Layne et al. fails to disclose the first and second prosthesis having scaffolds having spaced apart stent rings. Attention is drawn to Lentz, who teaches a graft prosthesis having discrete ring-shaped scaffolds (28) that provide radial support to the graft to prevent it from collapsing. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included discrete scaffold rings in the first and second prosthesis of the combination of Parodi et al., Pinchuk, and Layne et al. in the manner taught by Lentz to provide radial support to the first and second prosthesis to prevent them from collapsing

6. **Claims 32, 33, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parodi et al. (WO 00/16701) in view of Pinchuk (5,855,598) and Lentz (5,522,881).** The combination of Parodi et al., Pinchuk, and Lentz discloses the invention substantially as described above in paragraphs 2, 3 and 5.

Art Unit: 3731

7. **Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parodi et al. (WO 00/16701) in view of Pinchuk (5,855,598), Layne et al. (6,398,803), and Lentz (5,522,881 as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of Goicoechea et al. (5,609,627).** The combination of Parodi et al., Pinchuk, Layne et al., and Lentz fails to disclose the first trunk has fluoroscopic markers. Attention is drawn to Goicoechea et al., who teach markers (see column 10, lines 53-63) on a stent to ensure proper placement of the stent in the vessel. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included markers on the stent of the combination of Parodi et al., Pinchuk, Layne et al., and Lentz in the manner taught by Goicoechea et al. to ensure proper placement of the stent in the vessel.

8. **Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parodi et al. (WO 00/16701) in view of Pinchuk (5,855,598) and Lentz (5,522,881) as applied to claim 32 above, and further in view of Goicoechea et al. (5,609,627).**

The combination of Parodi et al., Pinchuk, and Lentz fails to disclose the first trunk has fluoroscopic markers. Attention is drawn to Goicoechea et al., who teach markers (see column 10, lines 53-63) on a stent to ensure proper placement of the stent in the vessel. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included markers on the stent of the combination of Parodi et al., Pinchuk, and Lentz in the manner taught by Goicoechea et al. to ensure proper placement of the stent in the vessel.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 23 and 32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

11. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan J. Severson whose telephone number is (571) 272-3142. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30-5:00.

Art Unit: 3731

13. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anhtuan Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-4963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

14. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ryan J Severson/
Examiner, Art Unit 3731
5/7/10

/(Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3773